



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,518	12/09/2003	Brian Jones	60001.298US01	3729
27488	7590	08/02/2007		
MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 2903			RIES, LAURIE ANNE	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/731,518	Applicant(s) JONES ET AL.	
	Examiner Laurie Ries	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 12-18, 20, 22 and 23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 12-18, 20, 22 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 March 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed 5 June 2007, to the Original Application, filed 9 December 2003.
2. The rejection of claims 1-9, 11-12, 14-15, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harold, Rusty Elliotte, "XML Bible, hereinafter "Harold", in view of Ayers, "AbiWord's Potential", hereinafter "Ayers and Rohr, "RE: Styles Again", hereinafter "Rohr", has been withdrawn, however, a new grounds of rejection has been added under 25 U.S.C. 103(a).
3. Claims 1-7, 9-10, 12-18, 20, and 22-23 are pending. Claims 1, 9, and 16 are independent claims.

Claims Rejection – 35 U.S.C. 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-9, 11-12, 14-15, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harold, Rusty Elliotte, "XML Bible, hereinafter "Harold", in view of Ayers, "AbiWord's Potential", hereinafter "Ayers, Rohr, "RE: Styles Again", hereinafter "Rohr", and Maslov (U.S. Patent 6,538,673 B1).

As per independent claims 1, 9, and 16, Harold teaches a method, system, and computer storage medium for representing style information in a markup language document including determining one or more unique properties corresponding to a style that relates to at least one section of the application document, determining whether the style is one of a set including a paragraph style, a character style, a table style, and a list style, mapping the determined properties of the style into at least one of a markup language element, an attribute, and a value, and storing the mapped properties of the style in the markup language document. See Harold, pages 1-12, teaching use of XML as a markup language in processing electronic documents. See, Harold, page 12, teaching association of XML and incorporating style properties with XSL. See specifically, Harold, page 8, last full paragraph, teaching XML as a storage format for word processors.

Harold does not teach expressly internally representing an application document in an application, such as a word processing application, where the internal representation is in a format that is native to the application and the internal representation includes unique properties defined by the application.

Ayers teaches: "The most significant difference between AbiWord and nearly every other word processor available is the nature of the native file format. An *.abw file is written in XML and thus is also in ASCII format; the files can be read by any text editor." See, Ayers, page 2, fourth paragraph. Therefore, Ayers teaches the limitation of "a document that has been generated by an application that uses a file format that is specific to the application," and more specifically, teaches a native file format in a markup language, specifically XML.

Rohr teaches including unique properties for describing fields within a document, such as character properties and paragraph properties. Rohr further teaches that the unique properties relate to at least one section of the application document, such as a paragraph within the application document (See Rohr, entire document).

Maslov teaches that the markup language document may be manipulable on a system including one of a server and another system to substantially reproduce the list without using the application that generated the markup language document, such as displaying, viewing, and navigating the XML document in a browser application, which, as was known in the art, may be executed on any computer system running a browser software application (See Maslov, Column 2, lines 34-37).

Harold, Ayers, Rohr, and Maslov are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of creating and manipulating electronic documents.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the representation of an application document in a format that is native to the application, as taught by Ayers, with the style information of Harold. The

motivation for doing so would have been to allow for an extensible definition of the list information so as to provide basic Open Source business applications for Linux, Windows, and BeOS users (See Ayers, Page 2, 2nd paragraph).

At the time of the invention it would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the definition of character and paragraph properties of Rohr with the functionality of Harold and Ayers. The motivation for doing so would have been to set the properties of the various components of the document, such as affecting the color of the text within a paragraph of the document (See Rohr, Page 1, italicized text at mid-page).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the manipulation of the XML document by another system or server, such as a computer running a browser application, with the markup language document of Harold and Ayers. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow multiple users using various operating systems, such as Linux, Windows, and BeOS, to view and navigate the markup language document without requiring further conversion of the document.

As per dependent claim 2, claim 2 is rejected on the grounds used in rejection of claim 1 above, and claim 2 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that claimed claim 1 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 1.

As per dependent claim 3, Harold, Ayers, Rohr, and Maslov teach the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Harold also teaches that additional properties

Art Unit: 2176

are associated with each of the set of styles such that the custom styles are generated by selected one or more of the additional properties (See Harold, Pages 333-335).

As per dependent claim 4, Harold, Ayers, Rohr, and Maslov teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Harold also teaches that the style is categorized according to one of a set including a version of a built-in style, a latent style, and a custom style (See Harold, Pages 333-335).

As per dependent claim 5, Harold, Ayers, Rohr, and Maslov teach the limitations of claim 4 as described above. Harold also teaches that a latent style includes a style that is a built-in style not yet instantiated by an application, such as a list of style sheet elements with associated styles as ID's. There is no requirement that all of the ID's be used. Style sheet elements that are built-in, or default, that are not used are not yet instantiated and therefore, by definition, are a "latent style." (See Harold, Page 332).

As per dependent claim 6, Harold, Ayers, Rohr, and Maslov teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Harold also teaches determining one or more unique properties to an additional style that relates to at least one section of the application document, mapping the determined properties of the additional style into at least one of a markup language element, an attribute, and/or a value, and storing the mapped properties of the additional style in the markup language document, such as teaching the STYLE attribute attached to an element to change a style in one section of the document (See Harold, Pages 333-335).

As per dependent claim 7, Harold, Ayers, Rohr, and Maslov teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Harold also teaches that the mapped properties of the style stored in the markup language document are understood by an application that understands the markup language when the style is not native to the application, such as teaching that XML may be understood by different applications and that the XML language is "self-describing." (See Harold, Pages 1-15).

As per dependent claim 10, claim 10 is rejected on the grounds used in rejection of claim 7 above, and claim 10 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that claimed claim 7 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 7.

As per dependent claim 12, claim 12 is rejected on the grounds used in rejection of claim 6 above, and claim 12 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that claimed claim 6 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 6.

As per dependent claim 13, claim 13 is rejected on the grounds used in rejection of claim 3 above, and claim 13 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that claimed claim 3 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 3.

As per dependent claim 14, claim 14 is rejected on the grounds used in rejection of claim 4 above, and claim 14 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that claimed claim 4 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 4.

As per dependent claim 15, claim 15 is rejected on the grounds used in rejection of claim 5 above, and claim 15 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that claimed claim 5 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 5.

As per dependent claim 17, claim 17 is rejected on the grounds used in rejection of claim 16 above, and claim 17 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that claimed claim 16 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 16.

As per dependent claim 18, claim 18 is rejected on the grounds used in rejection of claim 16 above, and claim 18 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that claimed claim 16 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 16.

As per dependent claim 20, claim 20 is rejected on the grounds used in rejection of claim 10 above, and claim 20 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that claimed claim 10 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 10.

As per dependent claim 22, claim 22 is rejected on the grounds used in rejection of claim 2 above, and claim 22 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that claimed claim 2 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 2.

As per dependent claim 23, claim 23 is rejected on the grounds used in rejection of claim 3 above, and claim 23 additionally incorporates substantially similar

Art Unit: 2176

subject matter as that claimed claim 3 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 3.

5. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. See, MPEP 2123.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 5 June 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Ayers fails to teach internally representing an application document in an application, wherein the internal representation is in a format that is native to the application, mapping the determined properties of the list into at least one of a markup language element...and storing the mapped properties of the list in the markup language document. The Office respectfully disagrees. Ayers teaches that a file is stored in .abw format, which is native to AbiWord. Specifically, Ayers teaches:

"The most significant difference between AbiWord and nearly every other word processor available is the nature of the native file format. An *.abw file is written in XML and thus is also in ASCII format; the files can be read by any text editor." See, Ayers, page 2, fourth paragraph. Therefore, Ayers teaches the limitation of "a document that has been generated by an application that uses a file format that is specific to the application", specifically .abw format. Ayers further teaches that the code is the markup language mapped from the properties of the document field displayed in the screenshot shown on Ayers, page 3. Ayers further teaches saving the document shown in the screenshot on Page 3, which creates the saved code that is saved in memory.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is 571-272-4095. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 6:00am-3:30pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Art Unit: 2176

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Laurie Ries
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2176